



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/006,790	12/04/2001	Tomoaki Masuda	04558/059001	9906

7590 03/13/2003

ROSENTHAL & OSHA L.L.P.
Suite 2800
1221 McKinney
Houston, TX 77010

EXAMINER

DI GRAZIO, JEANNE A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2871

DATE MAILED: 03/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/006,790

Applicant(s)

MASUDA ET AL.

Examiner

Jeanne A. Di Grazio

Art Unit

2871

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

Priority to Japanese Patent Application No. 2000-168054 is claimed.

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in Japan on May 6, 2000. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the foreign application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

Revocation of Power of Attorney and New Appointment

Revocation of power of attorney and new appointment is noted and has been updated.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaoka et al. (US '904 B1) in view of Miyoshi Isamu (JP 09-151627).

Per claims 1 and 10: Yamaoka has an optical compensating film (Col. 2, Line 59), a transparent film base in the optically compensatory film provided to act as an adhesive layer (Col. 3, Lines 9-11), where the adhesive is coated (Col. 5, Lines 46-56), and the transparent (adhesive) film is made of norbornene (Col. 3, Lines 60-67 and Col. 4, Lines 1-9). From the teachings of Yamaoka, the method steps of claim 10 follow. Yamaoka does not appear to specify an adhesive layer having an adhesive force of 10 N/20mm; however, Isamu does have an adhesive force of 10.0 N/20mm (PAJ). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

Art Unit: 2871

art at the time the invention was made to modify Yamaoka in view of Isamu to prevent rising (peeling) of an adhesive layer from its base and to prevent warping of a base.

Per claim 2: Yamaoka has a separator (treated with a releasant) temporarily bonded to the adhesive layer which acts as a surface treatment (Col. 6, Lines 7-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to surface treat the transparent film base (norbornene film) and to then provide onto the norbornene film an adhesive layer for the following reason: to prevent lowering of the adhesive force due to contamination until the adhesive layer can be suitably bonded (Yamaoka, Col. 6, Lines 7-13).

Per claims 6 and 13: Yamaoka recites an adhesive layer having a thickness within the range of 1 μm to 500 μm (Col. 5, Lines 57-60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have an adhesive layer within the range of from 20 μm to 200 μm depending upon the adhesive force (Col. 5, Lines 57-62).

Per claim 8: Claim 8 recites the elements of claim 1 with the addition of the optical compensating film adhered to a polarizing plate via an adhesive layer. Yamaoka has an optically compensatory film and polarizing plate bonded to each other by an adhesive layer (Col. 5, Lines 32-35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a polarizing plate and optical compensating film adhered to each other by an adhesive layer with the recited elements of claims 1 and 8 for birefringence characteristics hardly changed by heat and humidity and light weight per unit area (Yamaoka, Col. 1, Lines 40-45).

Per claim 9: Claim 9 recites the elements of claims 1 and 8 with the addition of an LCD using such an optical compensating film or polarizing plate. Yamaoka has an LCD that incorporates the compensatory film and plate. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

Art Unit: 2871

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have an LCD incorporating the elements as noted for a device of reduced weight and that can withstand external stimuli such as heat and humidity as noted in Yamaoka throughout.

2. Claims 3, 4, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaoka et al. (US '904 B1) and Miyoshi Isamu (JP 09-151627) in view of Arimoto et al. ('714 B2).

Per claims 3, 4, and 11: Yamaoka does not appear to specify a corona discharge treatment and a discharge frequency in the range of from 50 Hz to 500 kHz and a discharge amount in the range of from 0.001 kV * A min/m² to 5kV * A min/m²; however, Arimoto specifically teaches that the discharge frequency is preferably 50 to 50,000 kHz with a treatment intensity of 0.01 to 5kV * A min/m² (Col. 18, Lines 1-5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Yamaoka in view of Arimoto because the frequency range is a common range within which to perform a corona discharge treatment (See Arimoto's list of cited Japanese patents at Cols. 17 and 18, Lines 66-67 and Line 1) and because the treatment intensity as recited improves surface wettability (Col. 18, Lines 3-5).

3. Claims 5 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaoka et al. (US '904 B1) and Miyoshi Isamu (JP 09-151627) in view of Pekko (US '370).

Per claims 5 and 12: Yamaoka does not appear to have an adhesive of an acrylic adhesive; however, Pekko has a pressure sensitive acrylic adhesive (Col. 4, Lines 20-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

Art Unit: 2871

modify Yamaoka in view of Pekko to choose an acrylic adhesive that provides a secure and preferably permanent bond (Pekko, Col. 4, Lines 25-26).

4. Claims 7 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaoka et al. (US '904 B1) and Miyoshi Isamu (JP 09-151627) in view of Hani et al. (JP WO 92/22002).

Per claims 7 and 14: Yamaoka does not appear to specify a stretching ratio of a norbornene film ranging from 1.01 to 10 times; however, Hani has a norbornene resin sheet stretched from 1.1 to 8 times (see Hani). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Yamaoka in view of Hani for resistance against heat and humidity and for a birefringent layer optically uniform over an entire surface that maintains its uniformity even under changes of temperature and humidity as noted in Hani.

Art Unit: 2871

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeanne A. Di Grazio whose telephone number is (703)305-7009.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Robert can be reached on (703) 305-3492. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)746-8741 for regular communications and (703)746-8741 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0956.

Jeanne Andrea Di Grazio

Robert Kim, SPE

JDG

February 27, 2003

TOANTON
PRIMARY EXAMINER